

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.              | FILING DATE               | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/050,359                   | 03/31/1998                | DANA M. FOWLKES         | FOWLKES-4B           | 6741             |  |
| 1444                         | 7590 05/02/2006           |                         | EXAMINER             |                  |  |
| BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. |                           |                         | WESSENDORF, TERESA D |                  |  |
| 624 NINTH<br>SUITE 300       | STREET, NW                | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER         |                  |  |
| <b></b>                      | WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303 |                         |                      | 1639             |  |
|                              |                           | DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006 |                      |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.               | Applicant(s)                    |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | 09/050,359                    | FOWLKES ET AL.                  |  |  |
| Examiner-initiated interview Summary  | Examiner                      | Art Unit                        |  |  |
|   | T. D. Wessendorf              | 1639                            |  |  |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application         | n: <u>Final</u>                 |  |  |
| (1) <u>T. D. Wessendorf</u> .   | (3) <u>Todd Grabediar</u>     | 2.                              |  |  |
| (2)   | (4)                           |                                 |  |  |
| Date of Interview: 30 March 2006  | Time:                         |                                 |  |  |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applican | plicant's representative)     |                                 |  |  |
| Part I.   |                               |                                 |  |  |
| Rejection(s) discussed:   |                               |                                 |  |  |
| Claims discussed:  Prior art documents discussed:   |                               |                                 |  |  |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE   | ENEDAL NATURE OF WHAT         | TWAS DISCUSSED:                 |  |  |
| Applicants did not file an Appeal Brief.  | ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT         | WAS DISCUSSED.                  |  |  |
| Part III.   |                               |                                 |  |  |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>  |                               |                                 |  |  |
|   |                               |                                 |  |  |
|   |                               |                                 |  |  |
|   |                               |                                 |  |  |
| T n —1  |                               |                                 |  |  |
| (Evaminar/SDE Signatura)  | inant/Applicant's Dansacets   | ivo Signaturo if annonviata     |  |  |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli   | icanivapplicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |  |  |

| O-venezanie stiem Bes Ammont  | 09/050,359 FOWLKES ET AL.            |                                       |  |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Communication Re: Appeal  | Examiner                             | Art Unit                              |  |  |  |  |
|   | T. D. Wessendorf                     | 1639                                  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The Notice of Appeal filed on 27 September 2005 is not acceptable because:   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (a) 🗵 it was not timely filed.  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the appeal was not submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1).  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (c) the appeal fee received on was not timely filed.  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (d) the submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. The appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is \$  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (e)  the appeal is not in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31(a)(1) in that no claim has been twice rejected.  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (f) a Notice of Allowability, PTO-37, was mailed by the Office on   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The appeal brief filed on is NOT acceptable for the reason(s) indicated below:   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (a)  the brief and/or brief fee is untimely. See 37 CFR 41.37(a).   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the brief has not been submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2).  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (c)  the submitted brief fee of \$ is insu  | ifficient. The brief fee required by | 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) is \$              |  |  |  |  |
| The appeal in this application will be dismissed unless corrective action is taken to timely submit the brief and requisite fee. See 37 CFR 41.37(a)(1). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). See 37 CFR 41.37(e). |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| 3.   The appeal in this application is DISMISSED  | because:                             |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (a) the statutory fee for filing the brief as required under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) was not timely submitted and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.                         |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (b)  the brief was not timely filed and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (c) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed on   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (d)   |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| 4.   Because of the dismissal of the appeal, this a   | pplication:                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (a) 🛛 is abandoned because there are no allo  | wed claims.                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (b)  is before the examiner for final disposition because it contains allowed claims. Prosecution<br>on the merits remains CLOSED.  |                                      |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| (c) is before the examiner for consideration  | T.D<br>PRIN                          | WESSENDORF<br>MARY EXAMINER<br>H28/00 |  |  |  |  |
|   | ·                                    | H28/0C                                |  |  |  |  |

Application No.

Applicant(s)